



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/549,236	04/13/2000	KEVIN W. CARLEY	AND1P405	7816

29838 7590 10/27/2005

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP (ACCENTURE)
PLAZA VII, SUITE 3300
45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1609

EXAMINER

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/549,236

Applicant(s)

CARLEY ET AL

Examiner

Robert W. Morgan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/1/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. In the amendment filed on 7/1/05, the following has occurred: Claims 19, 24 and 29 have been amended. Claims 19-33 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure filed 12/1/03 has been acknowledge and entered in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19, 21, 24, 26, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to Edwards et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 to Hobbs in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,883 to Lee et al.

As per claim 19, Buchanan et al. teach a computer-assisted document generation system including a relational database (2, Fig. 1) used to manage document templates as well as storing, retrieving and manipulating data within the templates (see: column 5, lines 39-50). Buchanan et al. further teaches that the templates are created and selected by the user (reads on "selecting a data management template") according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: column 5, lines 5, 13-17). In addition, Buchanan teaches a document generation system using

Art Unit: 3626

relational databases that are implemented using a B-tree model and the database manipulation is preformed through program calls to executable functions provided to a program (column 5, lines 52-57). Additionally, Buchanan et al. teaches that once a user has defined (48, Fig. 2B) and selected a desired document template (22, Fig. 2A), in particular order, the template is stored on the electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) (reads on “wherein the plurality of keywords are arranged in the user interface in a tier structure such that keywords in a first tier are associated to data files that must be loaded into the database before data files associated to a second tier are loaded into the database”) (see: column 14, lines 5-15). This suggests that the user already establishes the order of the template and after completion of the document or file the load is sorted before it is loaded into the database.

Buchanan et al. fail to teach multi-tier client/server architecture, comprising the steps of:

- (a) maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database;
- (b) selecting a plurality of user selected keywords from user interface, wherein each keyword is associated to a data file name and a data type;
- (c) receiving from one or more of the user stations a plurality of user input data files that are associated to the selected plurality of keywords;
- (e) validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met;
- (f) loading the validated data into the database; and,

Art Unit: 3626

(g) compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template.

Edwards et al. teaches a network verification system including a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between two lists of data items, first list (160, Fig. 1) and a second list (170, Fig. 1), also indicating any data item in the first list (160, Fig. 1) which do not having matching data item in the second list (170, Fig. 1) or vice versa and then records them in an error report (190, Fig. 1) (see: column 26, lines 38-56) (reads on “validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template; loading the validated data into the database; and, compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template”). The Examiner considers the step of comparing data to included verifying the matched and unmatched data before it is compiled to generated an error report (reads on “generating error and summary reports for a data load”).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the validation of the loaded data as well as the compiling and generating of an error report as taught by Edwards within the computer-assisted document template system with a relational database as taught by Buchanan et al. with the motivation of detecting and preparing a summary report of matched and unmatched data in a database which better informs the user of any discrepancy involved with data being stored in the database.

Buchanan et al. and Edwards fail to teach multi-tier client/server architecture, comprising the steps of:

(a) maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database;

(b) selecting a plurality of user selected keywords from user interface, wherein each keyword is associated to a data file name and a data type;

(c) receiving from one or more of the user stations a plurality of user input data files that are associated to the selected plurality of keywords; and

(e) validating data by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met.

Hobbs teaches a multi-tier client/server model (reads on “a multi-tier client/server architecture”) for record retrieval from a database based on embedded expert judgments linked to words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text entered by the user (see: column 1, lines 20-42). Hobbs also teaches that Linked Term phrases are assigned symbols and associated file names (reads on “each keyword is associated to a data file name and a data type”) are then stored on the Application Server (207, Fig. 2) (see: column 17, lines 17-54). Hobbs further teaches a client/server system includes a user remoter PC client (200, Fig. 3) connected to front-end communication servers (210, Fig. 3) that run and feed application queries through a database interface (200, Fig. 3) to the designated Data Warehouse (230, Fig. 3) (see: column 14, lines 42 to column 15, lines 27). Furthermore, Hobbs teaches that a client (203, Fig. 4), coupled to the Document Server (202, Fig. 4), including a browser that establishes a connection with the remoter servers (reads on “maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database”) (see: column 15, lines 29-35). In addition, the client (203, Fig. 4) sends requests for information (client requests) to and receives information from the document server

Art Unit: 3626

(202, Fig. 4) (reads on “receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files”) (see: column 15, lines 29-42). In addition, Hobbs teaches

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the multi-tier client/server model for record retrieval from a database using linked words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text as taught by Hobbs with system as taught by Buchanan et al. and Edwards with the motivation of connecting “linked terms” to database records or templates, thereby saving enormous labor and time cost involved in updating a database (see: Hobbs: column 6, lines 55-61).

Buchanan et al., Edwards and Hobbs fail to explicitly teach (e) validating data by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met.

Lee et al. teaches system and method for creating validation rules to confirm input data using validation rules program (15, Fig. 2) (see: column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 19). Lee et al. further teaches nine comparison templates (481-489, Fig. 11) used to validate, compare and test the contents information entered into a field against one or more predetermined literal values, numeric values, character and alphanumeric strings (see: column 10, lines 19 to column 12, lines 7). The Examiner considers the comparison templates as capable of enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks since the comparison templates test the contents of fields against preset criteria.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include validation rules and comparison templates as taught by Lee et al. with the

Art Unit: 3626

system of Buchanan et al., Edwards and Hobbs with the motivation of using validation rules to test the content of field entered by a user to ensure that field is filled out correctly thereby catching any errors before the user leaves the service site (see: Lee et al.: column 2, lines 32-38).

As per claim 21, Buchanan et al. teaches the claimed user input data files are medical files (see: column 7, lines 37-45 and Fig. 1).

Claim 24 differs from method claim 19 by reciting a “system for generating...” in the preamble and recitation of logic in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a document generation system using a relational database that are implemented using B-tree model and the database manipulation is performed through program calls to executable functions provided by a program (see: column 5, lines 52-57). The remainder of claim 24 repeats the limitations of claim 19, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 19.

As per claims 26 and 31, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 21.

Claim 29 differs from method claim 19 by reciting, “a computer program embodied on the computer readable medium...” in the preamble and recitation of code segments in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a computer-assisted system that includes and electronic display (14, Fig. 1), data-processing device (16, Fig. 1) and electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) used for storing information within a relational database (2, Fig. 1) (see: column 4, lines 14-26). The remainder of claim 29 repeats the limitations of claim 19, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 19.

5. Claims 20, 22-23, 25, 27-28, 30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to

Art Unit: 3626

Edwards et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 to Hobbs as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,576 to Dauerer et al.

As per claim 20, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs teach a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards et al.: column 26, lines 38-56). In addition, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs teach a relational database comprising a series of data structure linked through common fields and the data structures are used to store user responses during document creation (see: column 5, lines 39-52).

Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs fails to teach the claimed no data are loaded into the database if any of the data does not match the data management template.

Dauerer et al. teaches a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: column 14, lines 20-26). Since Dauerer et al. teaches denying access to the system once the detection of invalid or duplicate authorization occurs (see: column 4, lines 47-59). The Examiner considers denying of access once invalid or duplicate authorization occurs to include record invalidation that basically interrupts any further transmission of the records associated with the invalid or mismatched information and prevents the storing of the record into database.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include transmitting of reports including mismatch data as taught Dauerer et al. with the system as taught by Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs with the motivation of

Art Unit: 3626

providing the user with several error report to ensure that inaccurate information is not being loading into the database.

As per claim 22, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Dauerer et al. teaches the claimed steps of separating data that match the data management template from data that do not match the data management template, and sending the data that do not match the data management template to the user station. This limitation is met by the comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards et al.: column 26, lines 38-56). In addition, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Dauerer et al. a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: Dauerer et al.: column 14, lines 20-26).

As per claim 23, Dauerer et al. teaches the claimed step of sending a notification upon detecting a concurrently executing load process. This feature is met by the data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: Dauerer et al.: column 14, lines 20-26). The Examiner considers the transmission of reports to a remote user as notification to the user of the data that is matched and mismatched as well as the data that is entered and not entered into database.

As per claims 25 and 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 20 and 22-23, respectively.

Art Unit: 3626

As per claims 30 and 32-33, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 20 and 22-23, respectively.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/1/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response 7/1/05.

(A) In response to Applicant arguments, it is respectfully submits that the Examiner has applied new prior art to the amended features of claims 19, 24 and 29 at the present time. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Buchanan, Edwards, Hobbs, Lee and/or Dauerer to the amended claims are addressed in the above Office Action.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3626


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is (571) 272-6773.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (571) 272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RWM
rwm


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600